

Cooper's Clarksburg Register.

COOPER & BRUEN,]

"WE STAND UPON THE PRINCIPLES OF IMMUTABLE JUSTICE, AND NO HUMAN POWER SHALL DRIVE US FROM OUR POSITION."—Jackson.

EDITORS & PROPRIETORS.

VOL. VII.—NO. 29.

CLARKSBURG, FRIDAY, JUNE 11, 1858.

WHOLE NO. 341.

TERMS.

Cooper's Clarksburg Register is published in Clarksburg, Va., every Friday morning, at \$2.00 per annum, in advance, or at the expiration of six months from the time of subscribing; after which \$2.50 will invariably be charged.

No subscription will be received for a less period than six months.

No paper will be discontinued except at the option of the proprietors, until all arrearages are paid up—and those who do not order their paper to be discontinued at the end of their term of subscription, will be considered as desiring to have it continued.

Advertisements will be inserted at \$1.00 per square of twelve lines for the first three insertions, and twenty-five cents for each subsequent insertion.

A liberal deduction on the above rates will be made to those who advertise by the year.

No advertisement counted less than a square. The number of insertions must be specified, or the advertisement will be continued and charged accordingly.

Advance payments of candidates for office \$3.00.

Marriages and Deaths inserted gratis.

All communications, to insure attention must be sent paid by the author's name and post paid.

THE SHERIFF'S STORY.

In my younger days I was a sheriff in a county of Maine in which I then resided. In the spring of 1839 a murder was committed, in a neighboring town, under circumstances of unusual atrocity. The deed was done by a Frenchman, whose name was Leste. He, with his wife, lived in a log cabin in the woods, some ten miles from where the deed was committed, and had long been suspected as being a thief and secrete of stolen goods.—I was sent to secure him, and you may be sure I did not relish the job much, but go I must. As I had ten miles to ride, I started early, and arrived at the cabin at about noon. Tying my horse to a tree, I went up to the door and knocked; after considerable delay in unfastening, more than was necessary, the door was opened by his wife, who demanded in no very pleasant tone, what I wanted?

"Is your husband at home?" I asked.

"No he has gone to the village, and will not be back till night," she answered.

"Then I will wait till he comes home," said I; and, without giving her time to reply, stepped into the room.

One glance around convinced me that the murderer was at home. A rifle stood in the corner of the room, which he had been cleaning; as I drove up, for the water was even then dripping from the tube I said nothing, however, but sat down and began to take a survey of the room. He could not have left, while I stood at the door without my seeing him, so that he must either left before I came, or else, which I considered more likely, was concealed about the cabin. My eye fell upon a rag mat, lying on the floor, and taking that up, the mystery was explained. A trap door was underneath, which probably led to the hole, or cellar, in which he was concealed. I lifted the door up, and was looking for some means of descending, when a push from the "gude wife" sent me down without the use of a ladder, and the door was suddenly shut. I tell you sir, I was in no enviable position, in a dark cellar with a murderer—for he was there, as I very soon after found out.

Thinking I heard him move, I took a step in the direction of the sound. In an instant there was a flash, a loud report, and I felt a burning pain in my cheek.—I saw him by the flash of the pistol crouched in the further corner of the cellar.—My blood was up, and I made a spring and closed with him. We had a sharp tussle, for a few moments, but at length I managed to get the bracelets on his wrists, and then it was all over.—Meanwhile his wife was above, standing on the door, and asking every now and then—

"Have you fixed him, Jim?"

Putting my hand upon the man's mouth and imitating his voice, as near as I could, I told her I had, and ordered her to lead the sheriff's horse into the shed.—My ruse succeeded perfectly, and as she left the room, I ordered him up the ladder, and by using the argument of a pistol, persuaded him to go. Once up, the rest was easy. His wife was some astonished when she came in, but seeing I was well armed made no resistance. The man was sullen, and refused to speak; but I did not care for that. I put him on the horse, and led the horse two miles through the woods, to the nearest neighbors. Securing the assistance of one of the "Men folks," I had him securely lodged in the jail that night, and he is now in the State prison serving his sentence, imprisonment for life. But that is the hardest fight I ever had; and I shall carry a mark of it to my grave.

Some time ago, on a Sabbath day, we went our way to one of our churches, and instead of a sermon heard an address upon some missionary or other benevolent subject. After the address was concluded, two brethren were sent round with baskets for contributions. Parson L., who was one of the basket bearers, taking the side on which we sat.—Immediately in front, and upon the next seat, negligently reclined our friend Bill H., a gentleman of infinite humor and full of dry jokes. Parson L.—extended the basket, and Bill slowly shook his head.

"Come, William, give us something," said the Parson.

"Can't do it," replied Bill.

"Why not? Is not the cause a good one?"

"Yes; but I am not able to give anything."

"Pooh! pooh! I know better; you you must give a better reason than that."

"Well, I owe too much money—must be just before I am generous you know."

"But, William, you owe God a larger debt than you owe any one else."

DEATH IN SLEEP.

A PASSAGE IN SHELLEY'S POEM, "LANTHE."

How wonderful is Death,
Death, and his brother Sleep!
One, pale as yonder waning moon,
With lips of lurid blue;
The other rosy as the morn
When throne on ocean's wave,
It blushes o'er the world:
Yet both so passing wonderful.

Hath then the gloomy power
Whose reign is in the tainted sepulchres
Seized on her sinless soul?
Must then that peerless form
Which love and admiration cannot view
Without a beating heart; those azure veins
Which steal like streams along a field of snow,
That lovely outline, which is fair

As breathing marble, perish?
Must puffeduence's breath
Leave nothing of this heavenly sight
But loathsomeness and ruin?
Spare nothing but a gloomy theme,
On which the lightest heart might moralize?

Or is it only a sweet slumber
Stealing o'er sensation,
Which the breath of rosy morn
Chuseth into darkness?
Will Lanthé wake again?
And give that faithful bosom joy
Whose sleepless spirit waits to catch
Light, life, and rapture, from her smile?

Yes, she will wake again,
Although her glowing limbs are motionless,
And silent those sweet lips
Once breathing eloquence
That might have awoke a tiger's rage,
Or thawed the cold heart of a conqueror.

Her dewy eyes are closed,
And on her lids, whose texture fine
Scarcely hides the dark blue orbs beneath,
The baby sleep is pillowed;
Her golden tresses shade
The bosom's stainless pride,
Curling like tendrils of the parasite
Around a marble column.

PLAYGROUND RHYMES.

One is all, two is all,
Zick is all, Zan;
Bob-tail, vinogar,
Tiekleo tom tan.
Harum-Scarum,
Virginia Marum;
Tee—taw—buck.

Onery, overy, eckery avon,
Nellibo, crackibo, tenor-a-laven;
Quevy, quavy, Irish Mary,
Tinklum, tonklum, tilo buck.

Mintry, mintry, entry corn,
Apple seed and apple thorn;
Wire, brier, timber lock,
Three goes in a lock.
Sit and sing,
By the wing,
O—U—T out.

"Aina, maina, mona, miko,
Barcelona, bona, striko;
Airy, wary, frown snuck,
Harico, barico, weo, wo, wack!"

Aina, maina, jekery on;
Foolan, ailen, Nicholas John;
Quover, quavar, English navor,
Stingum, stangum, jollo buck!
One-ry, two-ry, discom dary,
Hackibo, crackibo, Henry Lary;
Discom dandy, American time,
Humelum, jumelum, twenty-nino.

OW'D TO THE TIMES.

Notes on the "falling dew of eve"
Are pleasant thoughts in poet's songs;
But Notes on the eve of falling dew
To one to whom the cash belongs,
And who, not getting it, will sue—
Ain't so pleasant, by a sight!

SPEECH OF HON. A. G. JENKINS,
Of Virginia, on the Admission of Minnesota to the Union, in reply to Hon. John Sherman, of Ohio.

Mr. SHERMAN, of Ohio, having concluded his speech against the admission of Minnesota—
Mr. JENKINS rose, in reply, and said: Mr. Speaker: It was not my intention to address the House on this subject; and I should not have taken the floor for that purpose now, if it had not been for the remarkable course of argument pursued by the gentleman from Ohio, who has just resumed his seat. I have taken hurried notes of what he said, and will reply to his positions in the order in which he presented them.

The honorable gentleman set out with the remark that it might occasion surprise in the minds of some when they should discover him opposing the admission of a free State into the Union. A moment's reflection will satisfy gentlemen that those who will come in here as Representatives upon this floor, if Minnesota be admitted into the Union, will in their political opinions be radically opposite to the gentleman from Ohio. In this I find a satisfactory solution of the remarkable anomaly of the gentleman being opposed to the admission of a free State. As Democracy and so-called Republicanism are antagonistic throughout, so it requires no intellectual finessing to comprehend why the Republican gentleman from Ohio should oppose the admission into the Union of Democratic Minnesota.

The first proposition which the gentleman lays down, and in which he supposes that he finds an argument against the admission of Minnesota, is, that the wrong number of delegates were elected to her constitutional convention. I will read the law on that point. The third section of the Minnesota enabling act is as follows:

"SEC. 3. And be it further enacted, That on the first Monday in June next, the legal voters in each representative district then existing within the limits of the proposed State, are hereby authorized to elect two delegates for each representative to which said district may be entitled according to the apportionment

for representatives to the Territorial Legislature, which election for delegates shall be held and conducted, and the returns made, in all respects in conformity with the laws of said Territory regulating the election of representatives; and the delegates so elected shall assemble at the Capitol of said Territory on the second Monday in July next, and first determine, by a vote, whether it is the wish of the people of the proposed State to be admitted into the Union at that time; and if so, shall proceed to form a constitution, and take all necessary steps for the establishment of a state government, in conformity with the Federal Constitution, subject to the approval and ratification of the people of the proposed State."

It will be observed that this law is susceptible of two entirely different constructions depending upon the significance which you attach to the word "representatives." In a narrow and constrained interpretation of the meaning of that word, it would embrace only the members of the lower branch of the Minnesota Legislature. A more enlarged and liberal construction would also include the upper branch, or Senate.—This is a question of legal interpretation, upon which some difference of opinion might naturally arise. The honorable gentleman from Ohio prefers the former construction, which would have made seventy-eight the proper number of delegates to be elected to the constitutional Convention. The Legislature and people of Minnesota, of all parties, placed the latter construction upon the word; and acting upon this, called a convention of one hundred and eight delegates.—Now, sir, this was done in good faith. It could have been done in no other spirit. What could the people of Minnesota gain by putting this construction upon the law? Anything? No, sir; nothing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I submit to the candor and good sense of this House, if this argument of the gentleman from Ohio against the admission of Minnesota has any force or validity? How stands the case, sir, when plainly put, and disrobed of the sophisms which the honorable gentleman has sought to throw around it? Why, thus: Congress passes an enabling act containing such vague and loose phraseology as to admit of two constructions as to the number of delegates to be elected under it—a matter, by the way, of not the slightest importance. The people of Minnesota acted upon what they considered the proper construction, and elect their delegates; and now the gentleman from Ohio and his friends would have Congress reject their application for admission into the Union, because there might be some doubt about the hidden meaning of the law which we ourselves framed. Shall we, sir, avail ourselves of the vague phraseology of our own laws to perpetrate a great wrong upon the people of Minnesota, who acted in good faith, and placed what they believe to be the most natural and rational interpretation upon them? Shall we do this great wrong, too, for an immaterial matter—the number of delegates to their convention—a matter which concerns nobody but themselves? In thus availing ourselves of the vagueness of our own laws, would we not be imitating the example of the Roman tyrant, who hung his laws so high that the people could not read them, and then punished those who, through ignorance, were so unfortunate as to violate them? I trust I need say no more on this point.

But sir, another irregularity which the honorable gentleman advances is, that that convention was organized into two separate bodies. He designates them as a mob. A mob! It is a strange state of things when a "Topekaité" denounces a mob. I thought such language was reserved for the Democratic side of the House. I do not think that any man who acted with the Republican party during this Kansas excitement, and who during that excitement urged every conceivable argument to override law and order in favor of mobs, has the right here and now to make that objection.—He has no right to apply the term "mob" to a legally-elected body of delegates for the Territory of Minnesota. I say that, in no proper sense, can that convention, or the two bodies composing it, if you will, be characterized as mobs. The delegates were fairly elected. They constituted a legal convention. I do not care if they did separate into two bodies. I do not care if they retained a separate organization throughout. They finally agreed upon the same instrument as the organic law of the future State of Minnesota. It is not, indeed, the usual method for a convention to organize itself into two bodies. But should a convention do, yet finally concur in the same action, that concurrence must be considered as covering such irregularity.

But, sir, I go further than that, and I wish to say that one of those two conventions must have been a legal convention, upon the theory advocated by the gentleman himself. Now, sir, there were all the delegates elected under the law, and I care not how you divide them, if into two bodies, one of them must have been a legal convention; for one of them must have contained a majority of the legally-elected delegates. It seems to me there is no escaping this conviction. Mathematical demonstration could not be plainer, nor more satisfactory. In some cases it might be a matter of the first importance to determine which of these two bodies was the legal and proper convention. In this case, fortunately, there is no necessity for this inquiry, inasmuch as both agreed upon the same constitution. Now, sir, the gentleman knows very well that this is so. He knows very well that the final action of those two bodies corresponded in every particular. He knows very well that every member of the two branches of that convention ex-

cept some four or five absentees, signed the same constitution, word for word.

Mr. SHERMAN, of Ohio. The gentleman will see by reference to the Senate document (Reports of Committees, No. 21) that the members of the two branches signed different papers, though they may, upon comparison, prove to be alike. They kept up, however, a distinction to the very end.

Mr. JENKINS. I will only say, in reply to that, that I consider that action equivalent to signing the same paper.—It makes no sort of difference which paper they signed. Is it the paper which comes here which makes the constitution? I say, then, in the first place by way of a brief recapitulation on this point, that the convention was not a mob; that it was legally and fairly elected under the enabling act and territorial law; that it properly assembled; and if it divided into two branches, that fact makes no difference with the result, as they both signed the constitution; and that it was as justly and strictly a legal constitution as if there had been but one body. In addition to all this, sir, this constitution has the sanction of the popular voice in an almost unparalleled manner; the proportion of the whole vote being about the ratio of sixty in favor, to one against it.

Another objection which the gentleman from Ohio makes against the admission of Minnesota is, that the members of the lower branch of their Legislature are elected for life. Why, sir, if the state of Minnesota chooses to elect her Representatives for life, I cannot see that it is a reasonable objection to her admission. The gentleman may say that it is anti-republican; but I think the gentleman will find it hard to prove it. I admit that it is not such a provision as I would vote for; and if I were in a State which adopted such a constitution, and persisted in retaining it, I would remove from such a State; but I should not consent to see the despotic arm of the Federal government interpose to remedy the evil; for I believe the evils which would grow out of such a doctrine of interposition would be infinitely worse than those sought to be remedied.

It will not do, sir, simply to say that a feature of a State constitution, permitting Representatives in the Legislature to serve for life, is odious, and therefore sufficient reason for Congress to reject it.—I repeat, sir, that however odious such a feature would be, (and it would be as odious to me as to any man a living,) still that is a matter for the people of the incipient State to decide for themselves.—If they want such a constitution, it is their business, and not yours or mine, as members of a Federal Congress. If the people of a State want such a constitution, we cannot impose a different one upon them against their will. When they choose to change it they can do so. You must then show that such a constitution is anti-republican, or however objectionable it may otherwise be, the Federal Government cannot interfere. Is, then, such a constitution anti-republican?

How, then, shall we ascertain the true meaning of the term "republican," as used in that clause of the Federal Constitution which says "that the United States shall guaranty to every state in this Union a republican form of government." First, let us examine the term itself.—Is there anything in its general signification which would imply that it was incompatible with the idea of members of the Legislature being elected for life? Clearly not; for if so, where will you draw the line? Would it be anti-republican to have them made eligible for five years? No one will contend for that. Then would it be anti-republican to have them eligible for ten years? If not so for ten, then for twenty years, or forty, or for life? Where will the honorable gentleman draw the line, saying that it is republican to elect them for that number of years, but anti-republican to elect for a single year beyond?

But in order to approximate as nearly as possible to the true meaning of the word republican, as used in the Constitution of the United States, let us turn to the constitutions of the respective States existing at the time of the adoption of the Federal Constitution, and see what they were; for the very men who framed that instrument participated to a greater or less extent, in the formation of the State constitutions; and we may very well suppose that they knew what they meant when they used the term "republican." Referring, then, to the constitution of my own State as it was at the time of the formation of the Federal Constitution, I find that a large portion of the citizens of Virginia were not allowed to vote for any office whatsoever. This was indeed, sir, an odious feature, yet it will not do to say that this constitution was anti-republican, for it would be to stultify many of the fathers of the Republic who participated in the formation of the constitution of Virginia, and also in the formation of the Federal Constitution, which contains the guaranty of a republican form of government to the different States.

Now, sir, if the constitution of Virginia, at that time was republican, and surely no one will deny it, you cannot say that another constitution would be anti-republican merely because it allowed members of the Legislature to be elected for life. Certainly this latter feature in a constitution, permitting, nevertheless, a universality of suffrage, would not be less republican than a constitution with members of the Legislature elected for a shorter term, but leaving one half of her citizens totally disfranchised and unrepresented. I could mention other cases stronger even than that of Virginia; but I will merely call attention to Rhode Island.—Why, sir, though she had for a constitution only an old royal charter, the framers of the Federal Constitution and the fathers of the Republic considered it a re-

publican form of government. No one will have the hardihood to deny this, for it would be to assert that the whole origin and political history of the Government was a living lie. Sir, I need not animadvert upon the odious features of the Rhode Island government; they are well known. A minority governed, and the majority had no representation in the government. And now, sir, if this was, nevertheless, a republican form of government, which none deny, can it be urged, with a shadow of plausibility, that a constitution is not republican, simply because it elects the members of its Legislature for life? But, sir, I can afford to waive this argument—conclusive of the issue, as I think it to be. Yes, sir, I undertake to assert, and to substantiate the position, that there is not to be found in the constitution of Minnesota anything upon which a plausible argument can be based to show that the representatives in her Legislature are elected for life.

The only ground upon which such an assertion could for a moment rest, is the absence of a specific clause intended to regulate the same. But there are other sections in the constitution which cover the point by fair and logical deduction.—I will read from section 23d, article 4:

"SEC. 23. The Legislature shall provide by law for an enumeration of the inhabitants of this state in the year 1865, and every tenth year thereafter. At their first session after each enumeration so made, and also at their first session after each enumeration made by the authority of the United States, the Legislature shall have the power to prescribe the bounds of congressional, senatorial, and representative districts, and to apportion anew the Senators and Representatives among the several districts, according to the provisions of section second of this article."

Then in 1860, the period for taking the next United States census, at the farthest, it becomes the duty of the Legislature of Minnesota to make a different apportionment of Senators and Representatives of their Legislature, and to make their election accordingly.

But the next section is still more to the point, and will not leave the gentleman an inch of ground to stand upon.

"SEC. 24. The Senators shall also be chosen by single districts of convenient contiguous territory, at the same time that the members of the House of Representatives are required to be chosen, and in the same manner, and no Representative district shall be divided in the formation of a Senate district. The Senate districts shall be numbered in regular series, and the Senators chosen by the districts designated by odd numbers shall go out of office at the expiration of the first year, and the Senators chosen by the districts designated by even numbers shall go out of office at the expiration of the second year; and thereafter the Senators shall be chosen for the term of two years except there shall be an entire new election of all the Senators at the election next succeeding each new apportionment provided for in this article."

Now, sir, inasmuch as by this arrangement of the election of Senators, half of them are elected every year, and inasmuch as the same section provides that the Representatives shall be elected at the same time with the Senators, it follows, as a matter of course, that the representatives are elected annually. I do not think it necessary to elaborate this point any further. I will only add, that the journal of the Minnesota Convention shows conclusively, that a paragraph expressly prescribing the term of service of the members of the lower branch of the Legislature, and limiting the same to one year, was inadvertently omitted when the constitution was transcribed. Yet, sir, it was so well understood from other sections of the constitution which I have read to you that the term of Representatives in the Legislature was limited to one year, that it has never been made a serious question by the people of Minnesota, though it was well known that the specific paragraph intended to regulate the matter was omitted in the transcript. And, indeed, of so little importance was this omission considered, that when at a subsequent period various amendments were made to the constitution, nobody deemed it of sufficient importance to rectify it by restoring the paragraph referred to. Yet, sir, in the face of these facts, the gentleman from Ohio seeks to base an argument upon this, as authorizing him to reject the application of Minnesota to admission into the Union.

But another objection which the honorable gentleman from Ohio urges against the admission of Minnesota under this constitution is, that that constitution allows unnaturalized foreigners to vote, which, he alleges, conflicts with the Constitution of the United States, if it does not conflict with the Constitution itself.—Now, sir, I am very much astonished that the gentleman should have brought this forward as an objection to the admission of Minnesota into the Union as a State.—Will the gentleman from Ohio rise in his place and tell me that the sovereign State of Ohio cannot, if she pleases, permit unnaturalized foreigners to vote for members of her Legislature? I pause for a reply. The gentleman does not reply, and I therefore conclude that he is not anxious to commit himself upon that proposition. I think the gentleman ought to commit himself upon that proposition before he makes that an objection to the admission of another State.

Mr. SHERMAN, of Ohio. Ohio never did allow unnaturalized foreigners to vote, and never will.

Mr. JENKINS. The gentleman does not answer the question. He says Ohio has not; but he does not say she cannot, if she sees proper, admit whom she pleases to vote. In my own State we do not permit unnaturalized foreigners to vote. No man is more opposed to that than myself. If I had been a citizen of Minnesota, or a

member on the convention which framed her constitution, I should have opposed it to the last. I do not believe that any unnaturalized foreigner should be allowed to vote even for a member of the Legislature of the various States; but that is a matter resting with the individual States themselves. If the people of Ohio, or the people of Virginia, choose to permit unnaturalized foreigners to vote, they may do so. If the people of Minnesota choose to allow unnaturalized foreigners to vote, they can do so. And we have no right to urge as an objection against the admission of Minnesota under her present constitution, an argument which we would not apply to our own States.

But the gentleman from Ohio became very humorous in that part of his speech, and compared the admission of Minnesota to a wedding. He says he does not like to see our younger sister playing pranks in this way. He wants to see her wedded to the Union decently and respectably. All I have to say in regard to that is this: that if the gentleman wanted her to be wedded decently into the Union, he ought to have given her a decent license. I refer to the enabling act for Minnesota, which allows unnaturalized foreigners to vote for members of the constitutional convention. And I find that the honorable gentleman voted for that license. Here, then, is the very clerk that issued the license under which Minnesota is to be wedded, who comes up at the eleventh hour and makes use of the imperfection of that license as a reason why she ought to be kept out of the Union.

I hold in my hand the enabling act under which the members of the convention were elected, and I find the name of my honorable friend from Ohio recorded in favor of it. When I interrupted the gentleman in his speech to ask him if he did not vote for it, he could not see the application of the question. I hope he perceives the application of it by this time. Indeed, I think before he completed his speech he began to comprehend its application; for he endeavored to break its force and to account for its inconsistency on that point by saying it was late in the session, and that the bill was put through under the previous question. In reply to that, sir, I say that whether it was put through under the previous question or any other way, I am astonished that any gentleman holding a seat on this floor as a Representative, would make that excuse for voting for an act enabling the people of a territory to form a constitution, and then come here when the State acting under that full power, asks to be admitted into the Union, and pleads his own wrong as a reason why she should not be admitted. Sir, if the gentleman had any speech to make against permitting unnaturalized foreigners to vote, he should have made it then. That was the time he should have urged this argument against admitting foreigners to vote. I was not a member of the House at that time, but I see by the record that if the previous question was seconded on that occasion, the Republican party is responsible for it.

Mr. SHERMAN, of Ohio. I know that I, and a good many others assisting me, tried very hard to prevent the previous question until we might amend the bill.

Mr. JENKINS. I have got the vote on ordering the main question; and I find that a large majority of the Republican party was in its favor. Mr. Speaker, that only shows how gentlemen will resort to a subterfuge to accomplish their political purposes. Here is a gentleman who opposes a state coming into the Union—although not a slave State, a Democratic State—with three Democratic Representatives knocking at the door of this Hall; and he resorts not only to every subterfuge, on which he can base the flimsiest arguments, to oppose her admission into the Union, but he pleads his own wrong in the case.

I find that the honorable gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. Grow], a prominent member of the Republican party, moved the previous question on the passage of the Minnesota enabling act, and that a large majority of those who voted for it were members of that party.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman told us in his speech that he wanted the voice of the people in all State constitutions.—Well, if he has not got the voice of the people in favor of the Minnesota constitution, I do not know when he ever will hear the voice of the people. It speaks in tones of thunder with a greater relative majority, I undertake to say, than was ever given in favor of the admission heretofore of any other Territory as a State into the Union.

Sir, the popular voice of Minnesota proclaims thirty thousand for, to about five hundred against her constitution. If that is not the voice of the people, and a practical expression of it, I do not know where you will find it. This was a great fact staring the gentleman in the face, and how does he try to obviate it? Why, he says there was fraud there. Where are the proofs before this House of any frauds in this case? The gentleman said in his speech that there were newspaper rumors. Are the newspaper publications of the day to be used here as arguments against the admission of a sovereign State into the Union? If so, sir, a corrupt press, with a corrupt press, may hereafter keep out every Territory applying for admission into the Confederacy. I say, sir, I will hold him and his party responsible for making, this day and on this floor, this charge against the people of Minnesota of having sent here, as their organic law, a constitution which is the work of trickery and fraud.

A final argument which the gentleman adduced against the admission of Minnesota under her constitution was, that the people had recently made an amendment to it, which allowed a loan of \$5,000,000

to some railroad companies; but is that any business of ours? With what propriety can an argument of this sort be brought forward in this way? If they choose to loan five million, or ten million dollars, it is their own money, and not the money of the State of Ohio, or of the State of Virginia. Sir, it is idle and vain to use such pretexts as these to cover up a move upon the political chess-board.—It will strike every man of sense as being absurd and ridiculous in the extreme, to stand up here and talk about opposing the admission of Minnesota into the Union because an amendment to her constitution authorizes the government to loan money to railroad companies.

Mr. Speaker, as I said when I first rose, I had not the slightest idea of addressing the House upon this question. The remarks which I have made have been strictly in answer to the arguments brought forward by the honorable member from Ohio, [Mr. Sherman], and I have made them only because I thought those arguments were of such an extraordinary nature that they should not be passed by unnoticed upon this floor.

I have only to say, in conclusion, without stopping to canvass the merits of the various amendments offered to this bill, that I am in favor of the admission of Minnesota into this Union. I believe that no reasonable argument can be brought forward against that admission. No hue and cry can be raised against her on account of irregularity or turbulence in her proceedings. She comes here with a constitution formed by a legally elected convention, fairly and legitimately elected by the people, and with the voice of the people potential in its favor. The cry cannot be that there have been blood and fraud and murder in the territory, and that the true will of the people has been suppressed. Minnesota comes here with no stain of blood upon her garments; she comes attended by the handmaids of peace and plenty. I trust, sir, that this House will pass, by a large majority, an act admitting her as a State into this Union.—I trust that that majority will be so large that it will stifle the expressions that have gone forth from some gentlemen upon this floor of the Republican party, who have sought to insult and degrade the people of Minnesota by charging frauds upon them in their recent election. I trust that the act of admitting her will be consummated at once, thereby bringing another star within our political system, the grandeur of whose structure, the beauty of whose proportions, and the harmony of whose movements, will the admiration of succeeding ages.

WILD CAT MONEY.

The recent annoyance consequent upon the suspension of specie payments by the banks, brings to mind an incident which occurred something like twenty years ago in a Western city. The story may have been published, but we do not remember having seen it in print; at all events, we will tell it and run the risk.

At the time we speak of, a gentleman having in his possession ten or twelve hundred dollars on a certain banking institution away out West, went up to the counter one very fine morning, and addressed the teller in the following language:

"Good morning, sir. Beautiful weather? Ahem! I have something over a thousand dollars worth of your money in my pocket. Do you redeem?"

The teller says "good morning," smiles blandly and answers: "We redeem, sir, but we do not pay specie."

"Do not pay specie hey? Suspended, I suppose?"

"Suspended."

"What do you redeem with, then?"

"With bills on other banks," replied the clerk most pleasantly.

"And those, I presume, are non-specie paying banks?"

"Very probably they are, sir," bowing very politely.

"Well, then, what kind of bills can you give me?"

"Most any kind, sir. Give you Red Cat."

"Can't stand it!"

"Well, then, how's Gray Cat?"

"Wouldn't give a straw for a bushel of it."

"What do you say to Black Cat?"

"Tain't worth a cuss."

"Well, I'll try and accommodate you with White Cat."

"It wouldn't be any accommodation at all. I don't want your infernal Wild Cat Money—neither Red Cat, Black Cat, Gray Cat, White Cat, or Tom Cat. I wouldn't use it to litter a horse with.—Hav'n't you got some money on Eastern Banks?"

"No, sir"—softly and very politely. "Eastern banks are principally specie-paying institutions."

"If not Eastern, then, have you bills on any other banks that do pay specie?"

"No, sir," bowing most courteously.

"Well then, drawing his package from his pocket with a desperate expression of countenance, "Can you give me tolerably executed counterfeit bills on any bank that does pay specie?"

"No sir!" very loud, and looks as if he felt himself insulted.—Evening News Letter.

RECONSIDERATION.—The County Court Wythe, on Monday last, granted license for the liquor traffic to all who applied. One month before, the court refused.

Who was the most industrious man? "Job."